

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Claims 1-4, 6-14, 16-24 and 26-30 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) over U.S. Patent No. 5,898,841 (Higgins). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection. With regard to claim 1, Higgins does not disclose successively transferring data from linked buffers in a first processor system to linked buffers in a second processor system. Instead, as disclosed in Higgins, a direct memory access (DMA) transfer is directed to a single buffer associated with a particular application in a user address space (i.e., an end-point process). Higgins, col. 7, lns. 6-16. Accordingly, Higgins does not disclose linked buffers in either first or second processor systems, nor successively transferring data therebetween. Accordingly, for at least this reason claim 1 and claims 2-4 and 6-10 depending therefrom are patentable over Higgins. For at least the same reasons, claims 11-14, 16-24 and 26-30 are also patentable.

Claim 2 is further patentable over Higgins, as Higgins does not disclose transferring data from buffers arranged in a linked list on a first processor system to buffers arranged in a linked list on a second processor system. Instead, as discussed above Higgins merely transfers data to a suitable buffer associated with an end-point process. For this further reason, claims 2-4, 12-14, and 22-24 are further patentable over Higgins.

Dependent claim 3 is further patentable, as Higgins does not disclose providing descriptors that indicate the status of each of the buffers. Instead, the portion of Higgins cited by the Office Action teaches a frame header format that include various status information and a flag field regarding data frames – not buffers. Higgins, col. 2, ln. 15-col. 3, ln. 20. Nowhere does Higgins disclose descriptors to indicate the status of each of the buffers. Accordingly, for this further reason, claims 3-4, 13-14, and 23-24 are patentable over Higgins.


Claims 5, 15 and 25 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Higgins in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,651,111 (Sherman). Applicant respectfully traverses the rejection, at least for the reasons discussed above regarding claim 1, from which claim 5 depends. The rejection is further improper, as neither Higgins nor Sherman teaches or suggests transferring data between buffers within a cellular telephone. Instead, the mobile device of Sherman transfers data out of the device via a communication channel 480. Accordingly, for at least this further reason, claims 5, 15 and 25 are patentable.

In view of these remarks, the application is now in condition for allowance and the Examiner's prompt action in accordance therewith is respectfully requested. The Commissioner


is authorized to charge any additional fees or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 20-1504.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: July 30, 2004



Mark J. Rozman
Registration No. 42,117
TROP, PRUNER & HU, P.C.
8554 Katy Freeway, Suite 100
Houston, Texas 77024-1805
(512) 418-9944 [Phone]
(713) 468-8883 [Fax]



21906

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE